DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 568 CG 004 376

By-Frelick, John Paul

Radical Diversity in a Global Context: Theoretical Reflections on International Education.

American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Jan 69

Note-19p.; Paper prepared for the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Las Vegas, Nevada, March 30-April 3, 1969.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05

Descriptors-*College Role, *Cultural Factors, Cultural Interrelationships, *Cultural Pluralism, *Educational Philosophy, Ethnic Groups, Foreign Students, *Social Change, Social Values

The author discusses the current role of the university and its relationship to the whole of society in a global context. To the student personnel worker a particular problem is posed: how to encourage cultural contact, particularly with foreign and minority students while at the same time encouraging the conformity necessary for effective functioning, both in society and in the university. In our pluralistic society, we should recognize diversity as shared opportunity but in reality we partition society off into the "two culture" streams--the humanist and the scientific. Cultural pluralism tends to become cultural imperialism whereby the dominant culture seeks to absorb the subsidiary one to provide commonality. The role of the university is such that it can become more relevant to the world in which it functions by seeking cutural encounters beyond itself rather than by merely defending the majority culture and its ideological rationale. (CJ)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED032568

RADICAL DIVERSITY IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT
-THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION-

Paper in preparation for the American Personnel and Guidance Association on the theme: "Intercultural Dimensions of Personnel Development and Guidance Policy." March 1969.

John Paul Frelick,
Director, World Affairs Center
Beloit College,
Beloit, Wisconsin

January 1969

CG004376

RADICAL DIVERSITY IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

--THEORETICAL REFLECTION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION--

The contemporary world projects an agenda of reflection and action demanding broader scope than ever in history. For the university, the agenda implies radical reconsideration. What is the university? What are its aims? Is its teaching relevant? How does it relate to the whole of society in a global context? I shall discuss the latter question in detail. It may be that my inquiry will be heuristic in consideration of the former questions.

Guidance and personnel leaders are called to participate in the process of reconsideration for the assessment and definition of goals. It may be that people in the personnel field will have to claim their prerogative to be <u>full</u> members of the academic community with chief concern for student welfare, the humanization of education, <u>and</u> experimentation with the intellectual environment of education. The last is critical to our theme: "Intercultural Dimensions of Personnel Development and Guidance Policy."

For too long, student personnel workers have lived a stereotyped image: the valued but ancillary role of skilled technicians with knowledge in application of the behavioral and social sciences. So often they have been shunted into the student discipline committee or in posts, where when possible, the pieces could be reassembled after failure. But now, it is affirmed that their place must be assured in university-wide committees dealing with academic policy and institutional goal definition. The Hazen Foundation Committee on Higher Education recommended that all "colleges and universities .... recognize that all their administrative personnel play a role in education."[1] They argued explicitly that administration deals most frequently with students, and is thus most sensitive to student needs, but they also implied that it would be inane to proceed with student contact out of the total educational context. Thus, to work in the field of student personnel requires putting together viable educational structures. Ralph F. Berdie, past president of ACPA insisted on this in his inaugural address when he called on personnel workers to participate in the definition of institutional goals in order to "balance the world of the student,

that of the university, and the enveloping 'real' world that encompasses all."[2]

INTERCULTURAL AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

The effort is being made to discover the "real" world. With exploration has come an increasing awareness that education is parochial to the nth degree. Attempts to break out, e.g. Western Civilization courses, have been little more than inward constructed genealogies spiraling downwards to ethnocentrism.

Non-Western, foreign area studies, international programs, world affairs and overseas study have served as initiatory attempts to chart new routes. Accent on the creation of programs has, however, often obscured the need to reflect about the overall goals of education. Where reflection has led to perception of the world, decisions have been made to internationalize the curriculum.

Taken together, these steps form the essence of a new movement entitled intercultural or international education. Faculty, students and administration seek to open the university to the "real" world.[3]

There is argument as to terminology: whether to use intercultural or international. Intercultural education is preferred by many. I feel that accent on culture alone is restrictive in that political power realities are neglected. It may be said that intercultural exchange seeks value change through exogenous and endogenous determinants without deep enviornmental changes. As Chalmers Johnson has pointed out in his study on "Revolutionary Change, the source of innovation and its acceptance is "environmental change as well as .... value change."[4] "International education" englobes cross-cultural influences in institutional, historical, global contexts, highlighting factors of contingency and particularism while perceiving movements and processes, i.e. the process of internationalization itself.

Further, I detect a trend towards cross-cultural experience which is purely national,

within the "little cultures of American civilization."[5] Valuable as such encounter may be, it is not enough, even if for many it may be the only practical possibility. It means literally that sub-cultures are still experienced within the major culture context, that the general ecological system impinges on the discrete. Thus experience with other cultures also requires acquaintanceship with macrosocial systems, larger units, in a modernizing world of regional agglomorates and/or nations.

In revalidating the term, international education, I wish to save it from its narrow technical usage, application to foreign exhange/overseas programs, etc. If I lay claim to a new definition, it is because I believe the expression has laudable ideological overtones. International education is judgement on what education generally is not. It implies change in value orientation which would lead to structural modification. It aspires to become truly international. It suggests orientation outside of present systems. In a word, it is revolutionary in intent.

RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE

Change has become a truism. That it is doubly accelerating and accumulative is perceived by the most obtuse. Some would describe the modern ethos as omnipresent change in process. It has been dubbed modernization, a thrust involving industrialization and nationalism. Count von Kesselring prophesied almost a century ago that technology could be the great ecumenical force of the future. But within and through change, there does remain diversity of environment, of cultural expression, of social system, and of legal/political institutions. So while all men and nations may sense change and the force of change, critical action and reaction will reflect in differentiated response depending on the locus where it is experience, and the direction of its course due to different foci.

Internationalization might be described as part of the process of change which has made possible construction of descriptive models of greater uniformity and generality, vistas with convergent horizons. But internationalization in change may also be viewed

metaphorically as many rockets in space following different orbital patterns and configurations.

The university in the midst of an internationalizing, changing world, trying to conceive of the "real," surely has a difficult task cut out for it: there is no fixed place, no fixed time, no fixed goal. Looking at itself, in terms of the "real" world, we are to partake in an adventurous exploration heightened by a sense of excitement and expectation, a voyage of discovery and of invention through uncharted vistas.

"THE WORLD IS EVERYTHING THAT IS THE CASE."[6]
Wittgenstein

When we look at the world in our immediate environment, in school and university, we look for reflections of the pluralistic society we claim to be American, foreign cultures in our backyard. Catholic, Protestant, Jew.[7] Chinese, Spanish American, Black, Puerto Rican. Recent studies have revealed the reality of ethnicity in our own midst. Testing of pupils in New York City schools has shown strengths in different groups as to verbal ability, space conceptualization, number facility, etc.[8] "The greater salience of social class over ethnic membership is reversed in the present findings on patterns of mental ability. Ethnicity has a primary effect upon the organization of mental abilities, and the organization is not modified further by social class influences."[9] Ethnic variousness may prove that in some respects every student is in some way disadvantaged in comparison to others. Perhaps the Coleman report[10] should have shown such diversity to be shared opportunity. Comparative studies of American students in the United States and of Chinese students in universities in Taiwan and Hong Kong led to similar conclusions:

> It may be seen that Chinese male college students are significantly higher on Conformity and Benevolence. United States male students are significantly higher on Support, Recognition, and Leadership. There is no significant difference between the two groups on Independence.[11]

One might wish to criticize method reliability and test validity in these studies, but they do point to an incontested reality, cultural variety, ethnicity.

Which of us when confronted by a personal problem of a foreign student has not sought to determine whether it was rooted in the psyche or in shock encounter with another cultural/ educational system. The Peace Corps through sensitivity groups and simulation studies has done much to prepare volunteers for life and work in another culture. Their cross-cultural training concept has been advanced as an alternative model to traditional university models.[12]

To the reality of ethnic diversity in our world may be added the culture of poverty in our midst, so publically dramatized by Kenneth B. Clark, Oscar Lewis, and Michael Harrington. Julian Bond has referred to the ghetto as "the third world in our midst." Poverty and class bring different levels of conscious differentiation overarching the air routes connecting Paris, Algiers, Dakar, Geneva, Malaga, Calcutta and Akkra.

In such a world as this, the university, if it does not encounter, has at least been made aware, of cultural, social and economic groups and classes. But also within the university itself, there is division neatly partitioned into departments, which when grouped reveal the "two culture" streams, the humanist, literate, common sense world, and the world of science. The two culture postulate is an affirmation that knowledge is a way of life. "The merit of the (C.P) Snow formulation of the situation is that it highlights the fact that it is cultures, styles of thought, and not rival species of somewhat emaciated entities (propositions, statements, sentences), which here confront each other."[13]

To this rapid catalogue of diversity, might be added different types of educational institutions within and across national boundaries. In every university milieu there are variety of roles creating new life styles and patterns with divergent aspects, from faculty to students to administration.

In all our discussion above we have only begun to sketch the different cases that constitute the world.

COHESION, COHERENCE AND CONVERGENCE

We are well aware that in any social construct the values which serve to define a system also claim universality. Thus, a writ is served on any divergent cultural identity

to appear in court and justify its separate existence, to show why it should not merge with the dominant value motif. In America we are proud that melting of culture leads to commonality. Gunnar Myrdal recently asserted that "there is no country on earth which has a more common explicit ideology - more of a common explicit morality".[14] It is this ideology we have baptized "pluralism".

Somehow or other, a grand illusion has been built up concerning the nature of pluralism, either that it is a way station to a process of integration, or it is a permissive main culture giving temporary berth to sub-cultures which will someday disappear. Hegel's heavy hand weighs upon the dialectical motif in such a way that pluralism must resolve itself into virtual monism. My favorite example of this is a most erudite Ford Foundation Report, prepared by F. Champion Ward:

> "But is ethnic diversity, however generously embraced, the final state for our society? .... I suggest that this pluralism of subcultures, like the pluralism of national cultures in the world at large, is a half-way house only, not the higher synthesis we seek."
> "For at bottom, democracy is not a tribal ideology. Like science and technology, democracy is a universal principle claiming to be valid for all men .... Since it cannot stop short at the boundaries of a single race or nation, it cannot accept any final essential diversity among human groups. For democracy, such diversity can only be temporary and circumstantial, reflecting different limited perspectives on the full spectrum of possible human goods." [15]

Myrdal has the last word. True pluralism is coerced into convergence. It is a problem of culture imperialism of which we are all too unconscious, for in fact we practice it in insidious ways, unbeknownst to ourselves. Or is it? Is there not for many, as for Ward, an ideological pretension to universality from out of liberal democracy? In face of just such a synthesis, radical realism has affirmed the weakness of liberalism in its unimaginative denial of deep-rooted divergence and discontinuity.

Is it any wonder that black power advocates are suspicious of pleas for integration. Homogenization represents fusion and not continued identity. It is in this context of melding together that one can only smile sadly when he reads of a school superintendent, who in response to a survey on Black History courses in the schools, replied with a brief comment: "No Negro students".[16] Either ethnic realities are denied their true role, or they are confused

in the pot. Denial or bastardism. Or synthesis.

The movement toward a synthesized culture (which means the victory of one part over another), is the value system one enters if he is American. The foreign student often testifies to his feeling of being squeezed into a mold. We may feel that we have extended the outer walls of our culture construct through inclusion of polycultural realities, whereas we have practiced creeping imperialism by making our own backyard larger, embracing "the other" into our own.

Somehow the process is institutionalized by pressure from modern organizational realities which imposes its own ideological incarnation of rationality and efficiency, life patterns affecting outlook, behavior, attitude, and thought construct. Organizational form incorporates cultural solidity. This is true of both ethnic and class groups. Even where educational institutions aspire to recognize the integrity of "the other," external pressure is brought to bear.

> By and large the impact of widely accepted goals, mores, and social values fixes the program of American schools. When schools diverge from this vaguely defined directive and collide with potent groups in the political system, they feel pressure to conform.[17]

AND THE UNIVERSITY?

Just what role the university may play is not yet clear. Until the present, the university has fulfilled its obligations to institutional patterns and cultural realities in that it has not only imaged but rationalized the value structure. If I have taken some pains to indicate the movement to convergence, it is to make the academic community conscious of a reality in which it plays a significant part. In so doing, it does in fact continue its existence as a parochial ethnocentric structure, in touch with only one part and often a very small part of the "cases" that make up the world. It is surely not universal.

Now in such a moment the university has a choice, if it wishes to entertain relevance in the world around it. Either it can deny the external world, retrench behind walls and dig itself in and defend the majority culture and its ideological rationale. Or, it can seek cultural encounter out of its walls for its individual members. Many colleges attempt this by sending students and professors on exchange programs, so they may experience the world outside, whether in the ghetto or overseas. Of course, individuals do benefit from such exposure, but once back in the "system" are enclosed again. Intellectually they can wander out, much as does the artist to recreate artistic abstractions in space. But as persons they remain closed in.

Or, the university by an act of lucid response, can open itself to the world in which it lives. It can allow the world into the classroom, the office, the library, and invit change of policy and practice, teaching and research.

But having said that, we are back to our original question: what is the "real" world. In the end, this is a philosophical question. Observation has shown it to be one in which we seek to impose convergence. But just suppose, that the movement towards identity in our midst, really runs counter to the world, and that our pretentious attempts to create unity are doomed to defeat. Suppose, that universality is many, and not one.

RADICAL REALISM

When William James, the American philosopher confronted this question he composed a treatise too little read today, entitled: A Pluralistic Universe. Although he was concerned with the coexistence of good and evil, and sought explanation in avowal of variousness, his argument is useful to us. In a short tribute to Chauncey Wright, teacher at Harvard, he pointed out how Wright rather than seeking an "inward rationality," an explanation of order on the "supposition of a preliminary or potential disorder," objected to a "principle of oneness in the diversity of phenomena - some glue to hold them together and make a universe out of their mutual independence, he would reply that there

is no need of a glue to join things unless we apprehend some reason why they should fall asunder. Phenomena are grouped - more we cannot say of them."[18]

Further James stated:

> No matter what the content of the universe may be, if only you allow that it is many everywhere and always, that nothing really escapes from having an environment; so far from defeating its rationality, as the absolutists so unanimously pretend, you leave it in possession of a maximum amount of rationality practically attainable by our minds. Your relations with it, intellectural, emotional, and active, remain fluent and congruous with your own nature's chief demands.[19]

In this way, true pluralism, deeply embedded in the reality of things, respects individuality, seeks to banish "foreignness" (James' word for alienation) and allows for "intimacy" (his word for relation) within an "environment" (his word for contextual ethic). James felt that Hegel's description of the process of dialectical movement was accurate, but that his final synthesis of the dialectic in a rationalistic self-enclosed self-unfolding dramatic view of history violated his own primitive insight. Hegel tried to resolve what appeared to be disharmony when all he was doing was describing a new totalistic system. He created an absolute. James sought for each, its place in the world, where it would not be "foreign," its own "intimate environment."

Without delving further into the thesis of James, we can perceive a suggestion that intercultural communication does seek to contribute to the authenticity of what is other. In accepting that the university in one culture, has its own intimate environment where it is not foreign, is to admit that other universities have different environments. Neither can represent the uniqueness of the other. It is also to admit, that in a so-called pluralistic society, the university may indeed group different cultural realities, each of which may be enriched rather than dissipated. UNESCO in its declaration on intercultural cooperation called for an endeavor "to develop the various branches of culture

side by side, and as far as possible simultaneously."[20]

This radical realism admits to diversity at the very end. Stages of mutual cooperation and understanding are not built on the basis of commonality, but of "pro-existence", positive recognition of each for enrichment in reciprocity. To admit connexity between phenomena is not affirm fusion. James stated that phenomena might be grouped. A. N. Whitehead in exposing his doctirne of perspective pointed to the assumption that there is a "connectedness" which is the essence of types. So the universe represents a coordination of environment, "the totality of which we are unable to define."[21]

> There is no one behavior system belonging to the essential character of the universe, as the universal moral ideal. What is universal is the spirit which should permeate any behavior system in the circumstances of its adoption.[22]

Relation between disparate parts then does provide a place of meeting of cultures which may form a kind of common heritage for all, but only if each has its own "dignity" and "value." May it not be the role of the university to "respect" and "preserve" each?

By a kind of <u>analogia relationis</u>, from relatedness of culture forms and structures, national systems and structures, there may also be relatedness within the university world. In one form this may be expressed as "bridgebuilding." Practically this may mean that institutions will "stretch their own arms across the seas to help struggling new sister institutions" in emerging nations.[23] It may mean that established academies will need help from younger "sisters" to modify their cultural stance.

> Many universities, especially the oldest ones, are poorly fitted - by tradition, attitude and organizational structure .... They will need help to adapt to their changed environment and broader role. But upon their success in adapting may rest their own survival as influential institutions in society, and certainly the future progress of education in the world.[24]

Universities then will continue to welcome foreign students and scholars, <u>but now</u>

will make teaching relevant to guest as well as host. It will provide an environment where "guest" cultures can find "intimacy." This may imply that a particular institution will have to admit its own inability to do so, and therefore to commit itself to strengthen another in so doing.

I propose, then, an alternative strategy to those mentioned above, (see pages seven and eight--"And the University?"), rather than to open the university to the world unequivocally, the world may enter in diverse ways, let us devise a coherent strategy of recognition and support of "otherness," to maintain in the whole earth a community of common enrichment in learning. In such a view, it is no longer a question of how an institution is situated, but of how it is situated in rapport with another. It assumes that each institution only finds and understands its own environment as it helps another to discover and establish itself in its situation. In this way, the process of building bridges, of establishing communication, is the discovery of knowledge - discovery of what belongs to oneself, one's own culture, values and structures, by the maintenance of the other. Is this not the spirit which Whithead calls "universal!"

COMPLEMENTARITY

There remains the question of "the intellectual environment" in the university itself. In a sense, I began this essay with that question. It may be that personnel workers will strive for cultural identity and differentiation, for relation between groups and institutions on the basis of the radical realism espoused above, but there remains the world of the two cultures which criss-crosses the socio-ethnic realities, to create a kind of vertical schism in the whole structure of knowledge and the search for truth.

Just as we have affirmed cultural pluralism in radical identity, we shall in the same manner insist on diversity not only in the methods and manners of research and the pursuit of learning, but also in the "stuff" of knowledge. To put it crudely: there is

not a final totality which we can call TRUTH, there are only truths (a small "t").

> There are perspectives of the universe to which morality is irrelevant, to which logic is irrelevant, to which religion is irrelevant, to which art is irrelevant .... No one of these specializations exhausts the final unity of purpose in the world.[25]

Tendencies to image cosmic schemes enter into the dimension of importance, but these are always open. "There is always a vague beyond, waiting for penetration in respect to its detail.".[26] So we work with relative generalities, proximate and contingent uniformities. All attempts at universalization are really only "middle axioms," working hypothesis, postulates, which we cannot do without, but which are never ultimate. This in no way removes their deepseatedness in reality.

At the same time, we can affirm that we face not only an epistemological problem - the extent and possibility of knowledge, but also an ontological problem - whether in fact what we know conforms to what is. A. J. Ayer in a study of James, comes out for the necessity of an ontological choice in order to obtain "a viable picture of the world." Thus whether in the humanistic "Common sense" world or the scientific world, we must decide on what is "real" in the situation, and for the moment.

> .... the scientific and common sense descriptions of the world do come into conflict, if only because they compete for the same region of space. We can consistently accept the common sense statement that there is a table here, together with the scientific statement that there are a set of particles here, because there are independent ways of testing both statements, and these different groups of tests can each be satisfied. But if we are constructing a picture of the world, then I do not see how we can consistently think of this area as being exclusively occupied by a solid, continuous, coloured object and as being exclusively occupied by a set of discontinuous volatile, colourless, shapeless particles. In this position, we have to opt for one view or the other ...What is <u>really</u> there .... In the end it comes down to a choice. The word "really" in this special usage, calls for the expression of an ontological decision."[27]

Within this philosophical perspective then, decision can be made.

> The idea that practical consideration can be allowed to determine what there is, rather than to determine what is the case, is a modern development of pragmatism .... On this view, the question of reality becomes pragmatic just at the point where it goes beyond the question of truth.[28]

Thus we do not determine what is THE TRUTH, but what is true to the situation. This is not relativism but rather decision made in context, by means of relational analogy which affirms connexity. In terms of knowledge and truths, complementarity becomes a mode of affirmation and application. Quantum theory has shown us the necessity, the wisdom, and the possibility of just his path.

(A paragraph footnote need be appended here. One could argue that the philosophical position here set forth represents Anglo-Saxon pragmatism. Of course he would be right. In the exposition of a metaphysic one is caught in an ideologic posture. It is unavoidable. Frank admission leads to call for other efforts of reflection in the mood of the oft quoted saying: "Some men see things as they are and say, why. I dream things that never were and say, why not.")

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE "REAL" WORLD

I hope I have been able to demonstrate that a pluralistic perception of the world, of ethnic variousness, of social and political identities is the very stuff of life. We can live hopefully in this "real" world which is radically diverse to its very foundations, with equanimity and poise..

This is important to us in the field of intercultural, and international education, because decision-making is lifted to a level of participation with others. Decisions can be made without fear of impugning the integrity of the universe. It also means that radical diversity within educational structure and curriculum is not only a means, nor for that matter the totality of education, but it is at least a proximate goal, a "middle axiom." Philosophies of integration actually create unnecessary conflict by imposition of one life style.

We allow the "real" within the university, when we recognize in our midst tension between value systems, roles, national view points, ethnic groups. The academy in this way becomes an open stage where difference meets in creative confrontation within a context of mutuality, a respect for otherness. Admittedly the creation of such an ethos does depend on relationship - not necessarily stability of relationship, but authenticity of encounter. The role of the university is then one where in complementarity, relation and communication is established both analogically and in meeting. Common strategy permits the university to be in different places in different ways. Maintenance of community is preserved between the parts.

Some might call this cultural relativism. If it is, then so much the better. This however does not imply moral relativism. Rather it attests to creative tension, the acceptance of contestation.

* * * *

I love the image of Moses leading his people through the desert, led by a cloud of smoke by day and a pillar of fire by night, (are these two cultures?), moving about the wilderness - and he is never permitted to cross over into the promised land. He stays in the midst of his people (the twelve tribes) in dispersion. Here may be a parable for the university.

POST-SCRIPTUM

In my argument for consideration of "environment" above, it could be asserted that the setting is international. A planetized image of the world, would leave us with global concepts. I have argued for particularity and identity in a pluralistic makeup devoid of parochialism. In contrast, the global, integrative concepts lead to attempts at generalization, and universalization.

Generalization - It could be argued that a technological scientific world makes it possible to unite men at the level of truth and knowledge. But following Karl Jaspers, it would have to be acknowledged that:

> Scientific knowledge and technological skills are admirable things, fascinating and inescapable even for those who resist them. But their consequences and their obviousness are equivocal.
> We are told that modern science will unite us. It is indeed universally valid and rightly acknowledged everywhere, but it unites only our minds, not ourselves. Its unanimous knowledge yields no common ground of life."[29]

Generalized knowledge does not then include the humanist, common sense element. Its applicability, while global, is limited. It does not account for "intimacy." (See William James.)

Universalization - It could be argued that the process of internationalization leads to universal combinations drawing men into unity. The ecumenical spirit of the age evokes blurring of differentiation. In Grenzen, Paul Tillich writes that "peace comes into being where an old line of demarcation, even if it continues partially to exist, loses its importance and therewith its power to create strife and tension." But may it not be that respect for boundaries also lessens tensions. (See Robert Frost "Good Fences Make Good Neighbors," from "Mending Wall.") Whitehead talked of the unity of the Universe and the individuality of details. In accenting the "importance" of the former we should not lose "interest" in the latter.[30] In other words, let us hold universals and particulars in creative tension, lest the concrete world slip through the meshes of a net which presumes

to englobe all. A homely example illustrates: Frequently the U.N. Secretariat is called to make decisions from the perspective of the whole world. The officer in the field finds it completely inappropriate, untenable, and inapplicable. To reverse the image, and to show that tension remains at both ends, there is an old saw in the U.S. State Department (quoted by Charles Frankel) that: "The field is a place where people hope that something will happen in Washington. Washington is a place where people fear that somethings will happen in the field." My hope is that immobilism will not result if the tension is truly creative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1]The Student in Higher Education, Report by the Committee on the Student in Higher Education, (New Haven: The Hazen Fd., 1968), p. 64.

[2]Ralph F. Berdie, "Student Personnel Work: A Definition and Redefinition," ACPA Presidential Address, The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 7, No. 3, May 1966, p. 132.

[3]For an up-to-date description of the extent of international education programming, with an excellent bibliography, read, Allan A. Michie, Higher Education and World Affairs. (N.Y.: Education and World Affairs, 1968.)

[4]Chalmers Johnson, Revolutionary Change, (Boston: Little Brown Co., 1966), p. 69.

[5]Phillips Ruopp, The Educational Uses of the World, Experiential Learning and the Peace Corps, Peace Corps Faculty Paper No. 2, 1968, p. 6. This excellent and useful brochure does not intend to replace "internal" vs "external" cross-cultural experience, but it does argue for the world in your backyard concept, one of value, but not wholly comprehensive.

[6]IBID., p. 2. I am indebted to Ruopp for this quote from Wittgenstein, no source cited.

[7]Will Herberg, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, (Garden City: Doubleday Co., 1956).

[8]"What is Ethnicity?", Editorial, The Milwaukee Journal, Sunday, January 5, 1969. One example, verbal ability rating of first grade children tested 1) Jewish, 2) Black, 3) Chinese, 4) Puerto Rican.

[9]Daniel P. Moynihan, "Sources of Resistance to the Coleman Report," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 38, No. 1, Winter 1968, p. 28, cites monograph of The Society for Research in Child Development, xxx Nov. 1965, ed. Lesser, Fifer and Clark.

[10]IBID., The Winter 1968 Harvard Educational Review, has a special issue on the Coleman report on "Equal Educational Opportunity."

[11]Jesse W. Tarwater, "Chinese and American Students' Interpersonal Values: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol 7, No. 6, Nov. 1966, p. 353.

[12]Roger Harrison, "The Design of Cross-Cultural Training: An Alternative to the University Model," (mimeo) p. 29. Since published in Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol.3, No. 4, 1967.

[13]Ernest Gellner, Thought and Change, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964), p. 211. (cf. also pp. 208-217 for further discussion).

[14]Quoted by James Reston, "Nation Makes Turn Toward Unification," The Milwaukee Journal, Sunday December 22, 1968.

[15]F. Champion Ward, From Manpower to Mankind, Some Reflections on the Future of International Education, Pamphlet, (N.Y.: The Ford Foundation, 1967) pp. 6-7.

[16]Charles H. Harrison, "Black History and the Schools," Ebony, December 1968, p. 112.

[17]V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups, (N.Y. Thomas Y. Cromwell Co., 1964), pp. 12-13, quoted by Charles V. Hamilton, "Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 38, No. 4, Fall 1968, p. 672.

[18]William James, "Chauncey Wright," Nation XXI (1875) p. 194, reproduced as "Epilogue" by Edward H. Madden, Chauncey Wright and the Foundations of Pragmatism, (Seattle: Un. of Washington Press, 1963), pp. 145-146.

[19]William James, A Pluralistic Universe, (N.Y.: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909), p. 319. See also "The One and the Many," a chapter in Pragmatism, (N.Y.: Meridian Books, 1955.)

[20]"Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Co-operation" (Paris: UNESCO, 1967), pamphlet, p. 9.

[21]Alfred North Whitehead, Modes of Thought, (N.Y.: The Free Press, 1968), p. 10.

[22]IBID., p. 14

[23]Philips H. Coombs, The World Educational Crisis--A Systems Analysis, Paris IIEP, 1967), p. 195.

[24]IBID., p. 198.

[25]Whitehead, Op.Cit., pp. 11-12.

[26]IBID., p. 6.

[27]A. J. Ayer, The Origins of Pragmatism, (San Francisco: Freeman, Cooper and Co., 1968) pp. 321-322.

[28]IBID., p. 324.

[29]Karl Jaspers, Philosophical Faith and Revelation, Trans. by E. B. Ashton, (N.Y.: Harper Review, 1967), p. xxv "Preface."

[30]A. N. Whitehead, Modes of Thought, p. 8.